1. **Details of Module and its Structure**

Module Detail	
Subject Name	**Political Science**
Paper Name	**02: Indian Politics: II**
Module Name/Title	**Challenges of Democratic Transition and Consolidation**
Pre-requisites	
Objectives	**Paper tries to relate democracy to culture and mentalities of nations and hence find a way to solve the problems that plague the current world and make it a better place for us and also for the democracy to survive and prosper.**
Keywords	**Democratic Transition, Democracy,**

Development Teams

Role	Name	Affiliation
Principal Investigator	**Prof. Ashutosh Kumar**	**Department of Political Science, Panjab University, Chandigarh**
Paper Coordinator	**Prof. Sanjay Lodha;** **Prof. Rekha Saxena**	**MLS, University, Udaipur;** **University of Delhi**
Content Writer/Author (CW)	**Meera Verma , Reader**	**Janki Devi College, University of Delhi, Retd**
Content Reviewer (CR)	**Dr. Rekha Saxena**	**University of Delhi**
Language Editor (LE)	**Dr. Rekha Saxena**	**University of Delhi**

Challenges of Democratic Transition and Consolidation

Abstract

This paper analyses the concept of democracy in its journey through India and varied circumstances in various places of the world. It dwells on the ills of Indian democracy and then moves onto scrutinize the concept of democratization. Transition of democracy as it is the name given to journey of democracy scrutinizes the role of democracy and its effect on the people and countries with the passage of time. Democracy is not panacea and hence it has its pros and cons. Democracy itself has to prove itself in many countries as it has not presented itself as full-fledged system of governance which translates the aspirations

optimism of the populace. This paper goes in depth to investigate what have been the causes and their effects, their drawbacks and their possible solutions, modifications if needed at places. This paper tries to relate democracy to culture and mentalities of nations and hence find a way to solve the problems that plague the current world and make it a better place for us and also for the democracy to survive and prosper.

Democracy is a form of government in which all eligible citizens participate equally—either directly or through elected representatives—in the proposal, development, and creation of laws. It encompasses social, economic and cultural conditions that enable the free and equal practice of political self-determination. The term originates from the Greekδημοκρατία (*dēmokratía)* "rule of the people".[1]

Several variants of democracy exist, but there are two basic forms, both of which concern how the whole body of all eligible citizens executes its will. One form of democracy is direct democracy, in which all eligible citizens have direct and active participation in the decision making of the government. In most modern democracies, the whole body of all eligible citizens remains the sovereign power but political power is exercised indirectly through elected representatives; this is called representative democracy.

More recently, democracy is criticized for not offering enough political stability. As governments are frequently elected on and off there tends to be frequent changes in the policies of democratic countries both domestically and internationally. Even if a political party maintains power, vociferous, headline grabbing protests and harsh criticism from the mass media are often enough to force sudden, unexpected political change. Frequent policy changes with regard to business and immigration are likely to deter investment and so hinder economic growth. For this reason, many people have put forward the idea that democracy is undesirable for a developing country in which economic growth and the reduction of poverty are top priorities.

India is the world's largest democracy, seventh largest (by area) and the second most populous country in the world, with population of about a billion and a quarter. It has four main national parties: the Indian National Congress (INC), BhartiyaJanta Party (BJP), Communist Party of India (CPI) and the Communist Party of India (Marxist) (CPI (M)). The Indian National Congress has governed the country for 3/4th's of the time since independence from Britain in 1947, under the de facto one party system[2].

Factors influencing democracy

The success of democracy in India defies many prevailing theories that stipulate preconditions. Indian democracy is best understood by focusing on how power is distributed.

Religion is a major politically influencing concept. Political party support depends greatly on differentiating the electorate along religious lines. The major religious communities are those of the Hindus (although not a homogeneous block), the Muslims (again they too are differentiated as Shias and Sunnis) and the Sikhs; and many political parties are identified by the religion of their supporters. Many national religious issues are the key points of the success in elections. Even some of the political leaders use religion for their own sake and as a medium for their political stability.

Every 7th person in the world is an Indian making it the most populated country in the world, next only to China. The over a billion population poses a challenge to the state's ability to provide everyone with jobs, health-care, education and other public services. Slowing down the rate of population growth has been a major issue for governments, over time. . India being a democratic country the ever increasing population can only be checked by voluntary means, with the informed consent of the people.[3]With the current population growth rate, India is set to leave China behind by 2020.

India being on the path of development is major emerging superpower. India began as an explicitly socialist nation and continues with a large public-sector and many constraints on private enterprise, although recent governments have reduced some of these restrictions. Their reward has been faster economic growth, particularly through the growth of trade-oriented industry.

Other Factors such as education, corruption, women's issues, student politicsand criminalization of politics, leadership strategies and the design of political institutions affect national and local politics.[4]Women's Reservation Bill which has been pending for a long time in the parliament does not seem likely to pass in the near future. Some other factors such as the caste issue, environment policy, new long-term investment in the economy by foreigners etc., also have a bearing on the political scenario of the country.

Elected Representatives Undemocratic Behavior

The election process in India is pivoted around the commonwealth concept of representative. Even though the representative form of democracy has succeeded in driving the nation for the past 60 years, in practice it is yet to be implemented fully. Some of the elected representatives enjoy all privileges without being accountable for their duties, the dereliction of which goes unchecked along with influence peddling, nepotism, cronyism and willful negligence which bears testimony to their denigration of the democracy in India

Political Dynasty Legacy

Of the 65 years of post-independence rule, almost 60% of the time in office was held directly by Prime Ministers from the Nehru-Gandhi family and currently, some 12%, again by another member from the same family. This trend is no different at the level of the states too. Leading politicians are often accused of declaring and initiating their sons, daughters and other progeny, as heirs apparent, giving them a head start into power-politics. In India, dynastic politics is nothing new. Dynastic politics is not conducive to democracy no doubt but how much democratic is the Indian society yet? For a society which is still largely feudal with group and clan loyalty or individual worship still the rule of the game, just organizing procedural elections after regular intervals would not change the practice. If Indians are to uproot family politics today, we need to lead a comprehensive movement to change the very nature of India's democratic practice. India, like most other developing countries, has seen its democracy being built from top down and not bottom up, which gives an undue advantage to the politically/economically privileged sections to call the shots, leading to family rule. Withering the dynastic democratic rule cannot be done in a day as has been said. But what is certain that with deepening of democracy and increasing fragmentation of India's socio-political milieu owing to several compelling factors, the grip of family rule is bound to loosen. We have already seen that the Congress, despite remaining a family stronghold, is not that powerful an entity compared to what is was during the days of Indira Gandhi. A new

electoral Class comprising young, educated Indians, the ever-widening scope of the media, assertion of rights by newer socio-economic groups, an increasingly mature Election Commission, all these will help the Indian democracy deepen its roots further in days to come and reduce influence of dynastic politics.

Democratic Effect on India

The Democratic Effect on India has been too lax. Result of our system can be seen in the facts that even after more than 65 years of independence, we don't have electricity not even in cities forget about villages, transport is pathetic, education system is pathetic, health care system is pathetic, city planning is in sewerage, infrastructure is of 3rd class, no sense of security, open exploitation of law and regulation with criminals not only wandering freely but also controlling the masses, backward thinking of society, illiteracy, corruption, population explosion, environment and so on as the list is endless. Even a complete book can be written for each of these issues that how are these results of our failed democracy with examples and facts.

Democracy was defined as the system for capitalists by Karl Marx. Economists since Milton Friedman have strongly criticized the efficiency of democracy. They base this on their premise of the irrational voter. Their argument is that voters are highly uninformed about many political issues, especially relating to economics, and have a strong bias about the few issues on which they are fairly knowledgeable. Traditional Asian cultures believe that democracy results in the people's distrust and disrespect of governments or religious holiness. The distrust and disrespect spread to all parts of society whenever and wherever there is seniority and juniority, for example between a parent and a child, a teacher and a student. The 20th Century Italian thinkers Wilfredo Pareto and Gaetano Moska (independently) argued that democracy was illusory, and served only to mask the reality of elite rule. Indeed, they argued that democratic organization would do no more than shift the exercise of power from oppression to manipulation.

We need to design a new system devoid of loopholes and having positive aspects from different systems including democracy. It is not that democracy is completely useless. But it is much more important to implement it correctly and to understand the flow of power and try to see the loopholes that could arise in future. What we needed is the new system, an improved system with positive aspects of every type of system including democracy, framed not by leaders or the people of political science but by the people who are wise and worthy and are able to think in a broad way.

"*We will see how very important it is to bring about, in the human mind, the radical revolution. The crisis is a **crisis of consciousness**. A crisis that cannot anymore, accept the old norms, the old patterns, the ancient traditions.*" – J. Krishnamurti

Transitory Democracy

Democratization is the transition to a more democratic political regime; towards a more transparent more free and better governance. It may be the transition from an authoritarianregime to a full democracy, a transition from an authoritarian political system to a semi-democracy or transition from a semi-authoritarian political system to a democratic political system. The outcome may be consolidated (as it was for example in the United Kingdom) or democratization may face frequent reversals (as it has faced for

example in Argentina). In the case of India democratization came as a result of the British rule. Different patterns of democratization are often used to explain other political phenomena, such as whether a country goes to a war or whether its economy grows. Democratization itself is influenced by various factors, including economic development, history, and civil society. India too is on the way and in the grip of Democratization.

Causes of democratization

There is considerable debate about the factors which affect or ultimately limit democratization. A great many things, including economics, culture, and history, have been cited as impacting on the process. Some of the more frequently mentioned factors are:

Wealth- A higher GDP/capita correlates with democracy and while some claim the wealthiest democracies have never been observed to fall into authoritarianism, Hitler would be an obvious counter-example that would render the claim a truism.There is also the general observation that democracy was very rare before the industrial revolution. Empirical research thus lead many to believe that economic development either increases chances for a transition to democracy (modernization theory), or helps newly established democracies consolidate. [5]However, the debate about whether democracy is a consequence of wealth, a cause of it, or both processes are unrelated, is far from conclusion.

Education- Wealth also correlates with education, though their effects on democratic consolidation seem to be independent.[5]A poorly educated and illiterate population may elect populist politicians who soon abandon democracy and become dictators even if there have been free elections.

      The resource curse theory suggests that countries with abundant natural resources, such as oil, often fail to democratize because the elite can live off the natural resources rather than depend on popular support for tax revenues. On the other hand, elites who invested in the physical capital rather than in land or oil, fear that their investment can be easily damaged in case of a revolution. Consequently, they would rather make concessions and democratize than risk a violent clash with the opposition.[6]

Market economy- Some claim that democracy and market economy are intrinsically linked. This belief generally centers on the idea that democracy and market economy are simply two different aspects of freedom. A widespread market economy culture may encourage norms such as individualism, negotiations, compromise, respect for the law, and equality before the law.[7]These are seen as supportive for democratization as can be seen in India.

*Social equality-*Acemoglu and Robinson argued that the relationship between social equality and democratic transition is complicated: People have less incentive to revolt in an egalitarian society (for example, Singapore), so the likelihood of democratization is lower. In a highly unequal society (for example, South Africa under Apartheid), the redistribution of wealth and power in a democracy would be so harmful to elites that these would do everything to prevent democratization. Democratization is more likely to emerge somewhere in the middle, in the countries, whose elites offer concessions because (1) they consider the threat of a revolution credible and (2) the cost of the concessions is not too high. This expectation is in line with the empirical research showing that democracy is more stable in egalitarian societies.

Middle class- According to some models,the existence of a substantial body of citizens who are of intermediate wealth can exert a stabilizing influence, allowing democracy to flourish. This is usually explained by saying that while the upper classes may want political power to preserve their position, and the lower classes may want it to lift themselves up, the middle class balances these extreme positions.

Civil society- A healthy civil society (NGOs, unions, academia, human rights organizations) are considered by some theorists to be important for democratization, as they give people a unity and a common purpose, and a social network through which to organize and challenge the power of the state hierarchy. Involvement in civic associations also prepares citizens for their future political participation in a democratic regime.Finally, horizontally organized social networks build trust among people and trust is essential for functioning of democratic institutions.[8]

Civic culture- In *The Civic Culture* and *The Civic Culture Revisited*, Gabriel A. Almond and Sidney Verba (editors) conducted a comprehensive study of civic cultures. The main findings are that a certain civic culture is necessary for the survival of democracy. This study truly challenged the common thought that cultures can preserve their uniqueness and practices and still remain democratic.

Culture- It is claimed by some that certain cultures are simply more conductive to democratic values than others. This view is likely to be ethnocentric. Typically, it is Western culture which is cited as "best suited" to democracy, with other cultures portrayed as containing values which make democracy difficult or undesirable. This argument is sometimes used by undemocratic regimes to justify their failure to implement democratic reforms. Today, however, there are many non-Western democracies. Examples include India, Japan, Indonesia, Namibia, Botswana,Taiwan, and South Korea.

Human Empowerment and Emancipative Values- In *Modernization, Cultural Change and Democracy*,[9] Ronald Inlgehart and Christian Welzel explain democratization as the result of a broader process of *human development*,[10] which empowers ordinary people in a three-step sequence. First, modernization gives more resources into the hands of people, which empowers capability-wise, enabling people to practice freedom. This tends to give rise to *emancipative values* that emphasize freedom of expression and equality of opportunities. These values empower people motivation-wise in making them willing to practice freedom. Democratization occurs as the third stage of empowerment: it empowers people legally in entitling them to practice freedom.[11] In this context, the rise of emancipative values has been shown to be the strongest factor of all in both giving rise to new democracies and sustaining old democracies.[12] Specifically, it has been shown that the effects of modernization and other structural factors on democratization are mediated by these factors tendencies to promote or hinder the rise of emancipative values.[13] Further evidence suggests that emancipative values motivate people to engage in elite-challenging collective actions that aim at democratic achievements, either to sustain and improve democracy when it is granted or to establish it when it is denied.[14]

Homogeneous population- Some believe that a country which is deeply divided, whether by ethnic group, religion, or language, have difficulty establishing a working democracy.[15] The basis of this theory is that the different components of the country will be more interested in advancing their own position than in sharing power with each other. India is one prominent example of a nation being democratic despite its great heterogeneity.

Previous experience with democracy- According to some theorists, the presence or absence of democracy in a country's past can have a significant effect on its later dealings with democracy. Some argue, for example, that it is very difficult (or even impossible) for democracy to be implemented immediately in a country that has no prior experience with it. Instead, they say, democracy must evolve gradually. Others, however, say that past experiences with democracy can actually be bad for democratization — a country, such as Pakistan where democracy has previously failed may be less willing or able to go down the same path again.

Foreign intervention- Democracies have often been imposed by military intervention, for example in Japan and Germany after WWII.[16][17]In other cases, decolonization sometimes facilitated the establishment of democracies that were soon replaced by authoritarian regimes. For example, in the United States South after the Civil War, former slaves were disenfranchised byJim Crow laws after the Reconstruction Era of the United States; after many decades, U.S. democracy was re-established by civic associations (the African American civil rights movement) and an outside military (the U.S. military).

Age distribution- Countries which have a higher degree of elderly people seems to be able to maintain democracy, when it has evolved once, according to a thesis brought forward by Richard P. Concotta in this article[18] in Foreign Policy. When the young population (defined as people aged 29 and under) is less than 40%, a democracy is more safe, according to this research.

According to a study by Freedom House (an institution and a think tank) in 67 countries where dictatorships have fallen since 1972, nonviolent civic resistance was a strong influence over 70 percent of the time. In these transitions,"changes were catalyzed not through foreign invasion, and only rarely through armed revolt or voluntary elite-driven reforms but overwhelmingly by democratic civil society organizations utilizing nonviolent action and other forms of civil resistance, such as strikes, boycotts, civil disobedience, and mass protests." [19]

Democratization Indices

Freedom House categorizes all countries of the world according to a seven point value system with over 200 questions on the survey and multiple survey representatives in various parts of every nation. The total raw points of every country place the country in one of three categories: Free, Partly free, or not free. One study simultaneously examining the relationship between market economy (measured with one Index of Economic Freedom), economic development (measured with GDP/capita), and political freedom (measured with the Freedom House index) found that high economic freedom increases GDP/capita and a high GDP/capita increases economic freedom. A high GDP/capita also increases political freedom but political freedom did not increase GDP/capita. There was no direct relationship either way between economic freedom and political freedom if keeping GDP/capita constant.[20]

Democratization: Views and Reviews

Francis Fukuyama wrote another classic in democratization studies entitled *The End of History and the Last Man* which spoke of the rise of liberal democracy as the final form of human government. However it has been argued that the expansion of liberal economic reforms has had mixed effects on democratization.In many ways, it is argued, democratic

institutions have been constrained or "disciplined" in order to satisfy international capital markets or to facilitate the global flow of trade.[21]

Samuel P. Huntington wrote *The Third Wave*, partly as response to Fukuyama, defining a global democratization trend in the world post WWII. Huntington defined three waves of democratization that have taken place in history.[22] The first one brought democracy to Western Europe and Northern America in the 19th century. It was followed by a rise of dictatorships during the Interwar period. The second wave began after World War II, but lost steam between 1962 and the mid-1970s. The latest wave began in 1974 and is still ongoing. Democratization of Latin America and the former Eastern Bloc is part of this third wave.

Edward Said labels as 'orientalist' the predominantly Western perception of "intrinsic incompatibility between democratic values and Islam". Moreover, he states that "the Middle East and North Africa lack the prerequisites of democratization".[23]

FareedZakaria has examined the security interests benefited from democracy promotion, pointing out the link between levels of democracy in a country and of terrorist activity. Though it is accepted that poverty in the Muslim world has been a leading contributor to the rise of terrorism, Zakaria has noted that the primary terrorists involved in the 9/11 attacks were among the upper and upper-middle classes. Zakaria has suggested that the society in which Al-Qaeda terrorists lived provided easy money, and therefore there existed little incentive to modernize economically or politically.[24]With little opportunity to express themselves in the political sphere, scores of young Arab men were "invited to participate"[25]through another avenue: the culture of Islamic fundamentalism.

Democratic Consolidation

During the past quarter-century, the "third wave" of global democratization has brought more than 60 countries around the world from authoritarian rule toward some kind of democratic regime. **(1)**

Originally, the term "democratic consolidation" was meant to describe the challenge of making new democracies secure, of extending their life expectancy beyond the short term, of making them immune against the threat of authoritarian regression, of building dams against eventual "reverse waves." It has now come to include such divergent items as popular legitimation, the diffusion of democratic values, the neutralization of anti system actors, civilian supremacy over the military, the [End Page 91] elimination of authoritarian enclaves, party building, the organization of functional interests, the stabilization of electoral rules, the reutilization of politics, the decentralization of state power, the introduction of mechanisms of direct democracy, judicial reform, the alleviation of poverty, and economic stabilization .In fact, a stronger and broader generalization appears warranted: the single most important and urgent factor in the consolidation of democracy is not civil society but political institutionalization. Consolidation is the process by which democracy becomes so broadly and profoundly legitimate among its citizens that it is very unlikely to break down. It involves behavioral and institutional changes that normalize democratic politics and narrow its uncertainty. This normalization requires the expansion of citizen access, development of democratic citizenship and culture, broadening of leadership recruitment and training, and other functions that civil society performs. But most of all, and most urgently, it requires

political institutionalization. The most widely accepted criteria for identifying a country as democratic have been put forward by Robert Dahl--civil and political rights plus fair, competitive, and inclusive elections. **(2)**

Avoiding Democratic Superficiality

Many new democracies do face the threat of illegal or pseudo-legal overthrow by anti democratic forces. But in addition to the risk of breakdown--of dramatic, sudden, and visible relapses to authoritarian rule--many new democracies have to contend with the danger of decay, of less spectacular, more incremental, and less transparent forms of regression. While the former provokes a radical discontinuity with democratic politics (leading to open authoritarianism), the latter implies a gradual corrosion leading to fuzzy semi democracy, to a hybrid regime somewhere between liberal democracy and dictatorship. If democratic breakdown is the dominant concern and defining horizon of avoidance of our first concept of democratic consolidation, democratic erosion occupies the same role with respect to this second concept of consolidation.

It was Guillermo O'Donnell who at the end of the 1980s put forward the first explicit formulation of this extended understanding of democratic consolidation. In his seminal essay "Transitions, Continuities, and Paradoxes," he drew attention to the threat of silent regressions from democracy to semi democratic rule and incorporated the overcoming of this threat into his (broad) definition of democratic consolidation. Emphasizing the temporal dimension of his observation, he proposed to distinguish between "rapid deaths" and "slow deaths" of democracy.

While the former referred to classical coup politics, O'Donnell described the latter as "a progressive diminution of existing spaces for the exercise of civilian power and the effectiveness of the classic guarantees of liberal constitutionalism," as a "slow and at time sopaque" "process of successive authoritarian advances," which in the end would lead to a democradura, a repressive, facade democracy. **(3)**

In a recent article, Samuel P. Huntington even went so far as to assert that with third wave democracies, "the problem is not overthrow but erosion: the intermittent or gradual weakening of democracy by those elected to lead it." **(4)**

Rooting Democracy

The notion of democratic consolidation just discussed--completing the democratic transition by traveling from electoral to liberal democracy--represents one progress-oriented, "positive" version of democratic consolidation. Moving further on the "continuum of democracy"—by deepening liberal democracy and pushing it closer to advanced democracy--represents a second positive version.

On a more fundamental level, "democracy precludes closure regarding its own identity." It is a moving target, an open-ended, developmental kind of thing--and so is democratic deepening. Any fixed meanings we may attach to the concepts of democratic quality and

democratic deepening, and any consensus we may reach about them, can only be "temporary equilibria" open to future revision. As a result, if we associate democratic consolidation with democratic deepening, we get a concept of democratic consolidation that is open and bound less as well. In this sense, no democracy will ever be "fully consolidated," and it is quite understandable that authors who support such a notion of democratic consolidation are highly reluctant to extend the "certificate" of democratic consolidation at all.

Current Challenges to Democracy

The advancement of democracy is not only an essential goal in its own right, but it is also linked

- To peace building, by practicing the resolution of conflicts non-violently;

-To the consolidation of all human rights, through the application of the rule of law and social justice; and

-to economic growth and development, through government that invests in human capital because it is accountable to its people.

Lessons learned in advancing democracy

The process of learning to practice democracy meets challenges of various kinds. The first challenge lies in the fact that democratization takes place in often still authoritarian environments that resist change, in countries with weak states that provide insufficient security to their citizens, in countries with incomplete processes of nation-building, and in countries with poorly developed or skewed economies.

Furthermore, while there has been progress in the participation of women in the political arena, they are still a minority in the power positions of even most democratic states.

The second challenge lies in the inadequate and inappropriate international approaches in supporting democratic development.

The premise of "economic development first, democracy later" still holds for much of international assistance. It results, for example, in the promotion of liberal market reforms while reinforcing systems of autocracy in the process. That countries become economically as well as politically fit through democracy – as argued by the Nobel laureate ArmatyaSen - requires a comprehensive rethinking of how international assistance is delivered.

In order not to lose the hard-won momentum of the most recent democratic wave, support for democracy and for the activists struggling to advance democracy needs to remain a core objective of international cooperation and become an integral dimension of security and economic cooperation.

Efficacious Democracy

For many emerging democracies in Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America and elsewhere, the biggest challenge is to institutionalize the newly chosen multiparty democracy systems and to help democracy deliver in terms of reducing poverty and improving the quality of life. These

processes are slow and tedious, but today there is greater acceptance that security and economic development need to go hand in hand with improving democratic governance. Better governance means better conditions for foreign investments. Hence, governments that are genuinely interested in economic development tend to be more interested in democratic development as well.

Stronger regional cooperation can provide the framework for containing the violence and assisting democratic state- and nation- building processes.

At the same time, in some countries this instability has opened up the political system to the marginalized indigenous population, prompting new and sometimes controversial proposals to revise the constitutional architecture. Meanwhile, a few Latin American countries have made great progress in consolidating democracy, and they can play an important role as reference for the peaceful evolution of democracy and economic development in the region.

Consolidating Moderate Democratic Elements

Moderate democratic voices seek to be heard, but they have been repressed by autocratic regimes and drowned out by Islamist radicals who dominate the streets and have exclusive access to the mosque as an arena for political mobilization. Support must be given to democratic movements, including religious groups that can challenge extremists who misuse whatever religion to promote anti-democratic political agendas.

Intensive international dialogue is also needed with responsible political and social actors in the region about ways in which political reform can be supported in harmony with social, religious and economic reform processes taking place in the region.

A vicious cycle of permanent poverty, political exclusion, and massive health crises fosters feelings of hopelessness and encourages some to conclude that violence is the only way to redress grievances. Democracy coupled with economic development and the equitable distribution of resources is the only effective long-term antidote to these alarming developments.

Changing International Scenario

The global environment for the advancement of democracy has become more complex. The desire for democratic governance by people of all cultures needs to be reinforced by a re-invigorated multilateral system, which is essential for the strengthening of the international rule of law, and by developing multifaceted responses to religious and other forms of extremism which pose threats to the advancement of democracy.

The competition for scarce energy resources, in particular oil and gas, to sustain the levels of economic growth, is providing added pressure to the primacy of national economic interests over the advancement of democracy, including respect for the rule of law and human rights.

The globalizing market economy has also had a sizeable political impact, including in Western established democracies. The impersonal forces of globalization, seemingly so beyond peoples' control and comprehension, have often resulted in nationalistic and even xenophobic responses. The faster the world integrates, the more people appear to huddle in their religious or ethnic or tribal enclaves. Integration and disintegration feed on each other.

The forces of technology and capitalism with their global outreach and driven onward by self-generated momentum also create challenges to democracy by loosening the bonds of popular sovereignty through which democracy has traditionally flourished. Is there sufficient awareness and concern within established democracies that the dynamics that drive globalization also challenge the functioning of their own democracy?

Democracy should thus not be taken for granted, even in established democracies. The adagio 'government by the will of the people' requires an active discourse to ensure that the political system maintains its validity in the globalizing setting in which it has to function.

Conclusion

Democracy as its name indicates is a government of the, for the people and by the people yet it is to fulfill the aspirations of the people. Democracy as predicted has not been able to give results as due to many factors viz. lack of an understanding of democracy; social and cultural factors; differing states of industrialization among the comity of nations; lack of a forceful approach about democracy etc. But still, going by the democracy is better than all other forms of governments. No system is perfect and it is the people who make it better or worse. Every system gets conditioned according to its people and it is the duty of the people to make a system work according to their needs and wishes. Inclusion of women is now a "sine qua non" for democracy and world peace. Women are half the populace and we cannot hope to achieve our goals keeping them relegated. Today our world has become a global village hence democracy in one part of the world is related to anywhere else in the world. It's the need of the hour to treat democracy as the in thing and try prosper it as well as us for democracy and also for world peace.